

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR
THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA
EASTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)	
)	
v.)	CASE NO. 3:06-cr-141-MEF
)	(WO)
CLAUDE JEROME WILSON, II)	

ORDER

On November 13, 2006, the defendant filed an Unopposed Motion to Continue Trial (Doc. #19). While the granting of a continuance is left to the sound discretion of the trial judge, *United States v. Warren*, 772 F.2d 827, 837 (11th Cir. 1985), the court is, of course, limited by the requirements of the Speedy Trial Act, 18 U.S.C. § 3161. The Speedy Trial Act provides generally that the trial of a defendant in a criminal case shall commence within 70 days of the latter of the filing date of the indictment or the date the defendant appeared before a judicial officer in such matter. 18 U.S.C. §3161(c)(1). *See United States v. Vasser*, 916 F.2d 624 (11th Cir. 1990).

The Act excludes from this 70 day period any continuance that the judge grants "on the basis of his findings that the ends of justice served by taking such action outweigh the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial." 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

The motion states that the defendant has a long history of mental illness, has been diagnosed with schizophrenia and has been prescribed anti-psychotic medication in the past. Defense counsel had the defendant evaluated by Dr. Catherine Boyer and the evaluation is not yet complete. Following the evaluation, the defendant may request that he be sent to a

Bureau of Prisons institution where he can receive a complete psychiatric analysis. The defendant may have an insanity defense to the charged offense but that determination cannot be made until the psychological evaluation is complete. The government does not oppose a continuance. Consequently, the court concludes that a continuance of this case is warranted and that the ends of justice served by continuing this case outweighs the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. *See United States v. Davenport*, 935 F.2d 1223, 1235 (11th Cir. 1991)(reasonable time necessary for effective preparation is a significant factor for granting a continuance under the Speedy Trial Act).

Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED:

1. That the defendant's motion filed on November 13, 2006 is GRANTED;
2. That the trial of this defendant is continued from the November 27, 2006 trial term to the March 12, 2007 trial term.
3. That the Magistrate Judge conduct a pretrial conference prior to the March 12, 2007 trial term.

DONE this the 20th day of November, 2006.

/s/ Mark E. Fuller
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE